



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,163	09/17/2003	Sandra R. Bulson	POU920030140US1	8450
46369 7590 01/16/2008 HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C. 5 COLUMBIA CIRCLE ALBANY, NY 12203			EXAMINER TANG, KENNETH	
			ART UNIT 2195	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/16/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/667,163

Applicant(s)

BULSON ET AL. **MN**

Examiner

Kenneth Tang

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE \_\_\_\_\_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-18, 20-47, 49 and 50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-18, 20-47, 49 and 50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the Amendment on 11/5/07. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but were not found to be persuasive.
2. Claims 1-14, 16-18, 20-47, and 49-50 are presented for examination.

#### ***Specification***

3. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.
4. The same objection to the Specification was made in the prior office action on 7/24/07. Applicant failed to amend the Specification to overcome the objection or failed to traverse the objection made by the Examiner. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code in order for the objection to be withdrawn.

#### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claims 16, 20, and 49 are objected to because of the following informalities: They are dependent upon cancelled claims. Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. As to claim 37, it is non-statutory under 35 USC 101 because the claims do not fall within one of the four statutory categories of patent eligible subject matter (process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter) (see MPEP 2106). The system as claimed does not fall within the process, manufacture, or composition of matter categories. Furthermore, the system as claimed does not fall within the “machine” category because the claimed system is directed to software, per se. For example, the system is directed to comprising the “one virtual machine”, not the newly amended processor. Therefore, the system can be considered to be software, per se. To overcome the rejection under 35 USC 101, it is recommended to amend the claim similar to the system claim of amended claim 32.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. **Claims 1-12 and 15-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Borkowski et al. (hereinafter Borkowski) (US 6,978,455 B1).**

8. As to claim 1, Borkowski teaches a method of managing execution of requests of a computing environment, said method comprising:

obtaining by a processor (Processor 302 containing Virtual Machine Manager 310) of the computing environment a request to be processed (col. 2, lines 62-67); and

starting a virtual machine on the processor (Processor 302 containing Virtual Machine Manager 310 is a manager of virtual machines) to process the request, said virtual machine being exclusive to the request (exclusivity and no interfering from the semaphore) (col. 4, lines 25-47, col. 5, lines 6-11); and

processing the request by the virtual machine (col. 3, lines 21-50).

9. As to claim 2, Borkowski teaches wherein the starting is managed at least in part by another virtual machine of the processor (proxies and the virtual machine manager can communicate with the interface) (col. 4, lines 25-47, col. 5, lines 6-11).

10. As to claim 3, Borkowski teaches wherein said obtaining comprises receiving the request by another virtual machine of the processor, and wherein the starting comprises starting the virtual machine by the another virtual machine (col. 4, lines 25-47, col. 5, lines 6-11).

11. As to claim 4, Borkowski teaches wherein the receiving the request comprises receiving the request from a job management service (Command Code State Machine 314) coupled to the another virtual machine (Fig. 3, item 314, col. 3, lines 64-67).

12. As to claim 5, Borkowski teaches wherein the starting comprises providing one or more resources to the virtual machine to process the request (col. 3, lines 21-50).

13. As to claim 6, Borkowski teaches further comprising shutting down the virtual machine, in response to completing the request (Fig. 4, 412, col. 3, lines 50-58).

14. As to claim 7, Borkowski teaches wherein the shutting down comprises returning one or more resources provided to the virtual machine (Fig. 4, 412, col. 3, lines 50-58, col. 4, lines 5-10).

15. As to claim 8, Borkowski teaches wherein said shutting down (power down) is managed at least in-part by another virtual machine of the processor (col. 13, lines 12-56, Fig. 4, 412).

16. As to claim 9, Borkowski teaches wherein said shutting down comprises using by the another virtual machine a communications service to shut down the virtual machine (col. 13, lines 12-56, Fig. 4, 412).

17. As to claim 10, Borkowski teaches wherein said obtaining comprises obtaining by another virtual machine of the processor the request to be processed, and wherein the starting comprises: providing by the another virtual machine to a communications service coupled to said another virtual machine and said virtual machine a start indication indicating that the virtual machine is to be started; and using the communications service to start the virtual machine (col. 13, lines 12-56, Fig. 4, 412, col. 4, lines 1-35).

18. As to claim 11, Borkowski teaches further comprising: determining which processor of a plurality of processor is available (alive) to process the request; and sending the request to the processor determined to be available (col. 3, lines 21-39).

19. As to claim 12, Borkowski teaches wherein said determining comprises obtaining from one or more other virtual machines of one or more processors of the plurality of processors information to be used in the determining (col. 3, lines 1-39).

20. As to claim 15, Borkowski teaches further comprising processing the request by the virtual machine (col. 3, lines 21-50).

21. As to claim 16, Borkowski teaches further comprising providing from said virtual machine to a job management service information (Command Code State Machine 314) regarding the request being processed (Fig. 3, item 314, col. 3, lines 64-67).

22. As to claim 17, Borkowski teaches wherein said virtual machine is a sanitized virtual machine (col. 5, lines 6-11, col. 4, lines 30-47).

23. As to claim 18, similar to claim 1, Borkowski teaches a method of managing initiation of virtual machines of a computing environment, said method comprising:

determining by one virtual machine on a processor (Processor 302 containing Virtual Machine Manager 310) of a computing environment that another virtual machine is to be initiated, wherein the determining is in response to receiving by the one virtual machine a request to be processed (Virtual Machine Manager 310 is a manager of virtual machines) (col. 2, lines 62-67);

initiating, by the one virtual machine, the another virtual machine (col. 2, lines 62-67);



processing the request by the another virtual machine (each proxy and the virtual machine manager can communicate with the interface) (col. 4, lines 25-47, col. 5, lines 6-11).

24. As to claim 20, Borkowski teaches wherein the request is for utilization of machine resources (col. 3, lines 21-50).

25. As to claim 21, Borkowski teaches wherein said initiating comprises using by the one virtual machine a communications service in initiating the another virtual machine (col. 4, lines 25-47, col. 5, lines 6-11).

26. As to claim 22, Borkowski teaches a method of providing an on-demand (demand by a request) infrastructure, said method comprising:

deploying logic on at least one processor of a computing environment to automatically provide a virtual machine on-demand in response to a request, and to process the request by the virtual machine (col. 3, lines 3-50 and col. 4, lines 25-48, Fig. 3, 310, 312-N, 314).

27. As to claim 23, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1.

28. As to claim 24, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 3.
29. As to claim 25, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 5.
30. As to claim 26, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 6. In addition, it is noted that the newly amended limitation of "wherein the processor is able to shut down..." merely recites an intended use.
31. As to claim 27, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 8.
32. As to claim 28, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 10.
33. As to claim 29, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 11.
34. As to claim 30, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 12.
35. As to claim 31, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 16.

36. As to claim 32, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 18.

37. As to claim 33, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 19.

38. As to claim 34, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 20.

39. As to claim 35, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 21.

40. As to claim 36, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1.

41. As to claim 37, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1.

42. As to claims 38-46, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claims 23-31.

43. As to claims 47-50, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claims 18-21.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**44. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borkowski et al. (hereinafter Borkowski) (US 6,978,455 B1) in view of Johnson (US 6,788,980 B1).**

45. As to claim 13, Borkowski is silent in teaching wherein said plurality of processors include at least one processor that is heterogeneous to another processor. However, Johnson teaches a virtual machine environment that includes processors that are heterogeneous (see Abstract, col. 2, lines 15-28, col. 7, lines 48-58). Borkowski and Johnson are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of a virtual machine environment. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Borkowski's virtual machine environment to include Johnson's feature of heterogeneous processors/devices in a virtual machine environment. The suggestion/motivation for doing so

would have been to allow for communication/harmonization between the processors (col. 2, lines 15-55, col. 3, lines 23-25).

46. As to claim 14, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 13.

***Response to Arguments***

47. Applicant's amendment to the claims have overcome all of the 35 USC 101 rejections, except for claim 37. Applicant's amendment to claim 37 was not sufficient to overcome the 35 USC 101 rejection. As to claim 37, it is non-statutory under 35 USC 101 because the claims do not fall within one of the four statutory categories of patent eligible subject matter (process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter) (see MPEP 2106). The system as claimed does not fall within the process, manufacture, or composition of matter categories. Furthermore, the system as claimed does not fall within the "machine" category because the claimed system can be directed to software, per se. For example, the system is directed to comprising the "one virtual machine", not the newly amended processor. Therefore, the system is considered to be software, per se. To overcome the rejection under 35 USC 101, it is recommended to amend the claim similar to the system claim of amended claim 32.

48. *Regarding independent claim 1 (as well as independent claims 18, 22, 23, 32, 36-38, and 47), Applicant agrees in the Remarks (on the last paragraph of page 12 through the first paragraph of page 13) that Borkowski's "proxies" are not exclusive to requests.*

49. Applicant's Specification discloses that by utilizing a virtual machine that is "exclusive" to the request, isolation between requests is provided (see page 4, [0018], lines 1-2). As cited in the Office Action by the Examiner, col. 5, lines 6-11 of Borkowski teaches using semaphores to provide this exclusivity and isolation for requests/communication involving the proxies.

50. Background information from Silberschatz's "Operating System Concepts": Every process has a segment of code, called a critical section, in which the process may be changing common variables, updating a table, writing a file, and so on (page 157, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of section 6.2 The Critical-Section Problem). What is vital is that when one process is executing in its critical section, no other process is to be allowed to execute in its critical section. Thus, the execution of critical sections by the processes is *mutually exclusive* in time. Semaphores are used as a synchronization tool for mutual exclusion (page 167, first paragraph of Section 6.4 Semaphores).

51. Therefore, Borkowski's use of semaphores to provide mutual exclusion for requests/communication involving the proxies satisfies the claimed limitation based on Applicant's own example definition in the Specification. During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad

interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

52. *Applicant also argues on page 13 of the Remarks that in dependent claim 6 and 26 that the limitation of shutting down the virtual machine in response to completing the request, while Borkowski teaches powering down the teller/scanners leading to shut down of the state machine.*

53. The Examiner asserts that the machine proxies 312-1 to 312-N are “virtual machines”, managed by virtual machine manager 310 for the teller/scanner units 300-1 through 300-N. As these teller/scanner units are related to the proxies, they are affected as they are shut down.

54. Furthermore, shutting down the virtual machine in response to completing the request is a requirement. Silberschtaz's "Operating System Concepts" shows that a process must request a resource before using it and must release the resource after using it (page 208, 3rd paragraph).

55. Applicant does not provide any arguments for the remainder of presented claims.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Silberschtaz et al. (“Operating System Concepts”, 1999) teaches that the general concept of virtual machines involves an operating system that can create the illusion of multiple processes, each executing on its own processor with its own

(virtual) memory (last paragraph of page 76). The general virtual machine concept provides protection of the various system resources. Each virtual machine is completely isolated from all other virtual machines, so there are no security problems (page 77, lines 1-2)

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Tang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3772. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 6:00PM, Every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.




Application/Control Number:  
10/667,163  
Art Unit: 2195

Page 16

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kt  
1/8/08

  
MENG-LI T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100